

claims 11-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants responded to the rejections in the Amendment filed June 27, 2002, however, the Examiner indicated in an Office Action dated September 30, 2002, that Applicants had failed to respond to the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

According to the Examiner, Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the phrase "binary actions" in claim 18 is vague and indefinite.

Applicants assert that one skilled in the art would understand the meaning of the term "binary function" used in the claims given the teaching of the specification. In this regard, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 19, lines 3-6 of the present specification which states the following;

"[t]he semantic entries for actions not only categorize the actions, but also specify features for each action.

For example, one feature provides the number of arguments that are expected for the action, *i.e.*, ***some actions are associated with two arguments*** because they have an agent and a target as "inactivate", and others just have an agent "mutate."

In view of the above, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Entry of the foregoing remarks into the file of the above-identified application is respectfully requested. Withdrawal of all rejections and reconsideration of the claims is requested. An early allowance is earnestly sought.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 30, 2003

Carmella L. Stephens
Henry Tang
Patent Office Reg. No. 29,705

Carmella L. Stephens
Patent Office Reg. No. 41,328

BAKER BOTT S L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-4498

Attorney for Applicants
(212) 408-2539